

# The Sun

FRIDAY, JULY 17, 1896.

LOCAL NEWS.—The City and Suburban News Bureau of the United Press and New York Associated Press is at 91 to 99 Ann street. All information and documents for public use instantly disseminated to the press of the whole country.

## The Issue in Silver Pure.

The issue of the day will be better understood if we drop the confusing figures of 16 to 1, stop talking of gold, which neither party proposes to touch directly, and consider silver alone.

The old silver dollar contained 87 1/2 grains of silver. During the fifty years after 1834, when gold became the single standard of the United States, 37 1/2 grains of silver were worth more than a dollar, and hence no silver was coined. When silver was "demonetized" in 1873 a coined dollar of it was worth \$1.03. As no silver was being coined, its demonetization, done in full light of long and open discussion, was the mere repealing of an obsolete law. To-day, owing mainly to the enormous increase in silver production, 37 1/2 grains are worth only fifty-three cents, and the BRYAN issue is to give men the right to call this fifty-three cents worth of silver a dollar. That is square and bare repudiation.

It would be equally proper, equally just, and equally honest to call fifty-three cents' worth of copper a dollar.

The BRYAN men keep themselves in countenance with the argument that 37 1/2 grains of silver constituted a dollar years ago, and copper never did. Then they undertake to give an air of sanctity to their piratical scheme by inflammatory attacks on gold. Their one hope is so to excite a majority of the public with a sense of hatred against the rich and the financial system under which people have prospered that they will crazily strike at it, even to the paralysis or wreck of industry in general.

## The Two Parties in the Campaign.

The silver Republicans have joined the Chicago platform Democrats in support of the Chicago platform and in accordance with an arrangement between the silver leaders in both parties made before the assembling of the two Conventions. These two old party lines are obliterated for the time being. The silver Republicans put aside their tariff convictions for the occasion in order to further the cause they have most at heart. The Democrats responded to this renunciation by declaring at Chicago that the agitation of the tariff question should be kept in abeyance "until the money question is settled."

The bolting minority of the Republicans at St. Louis and the triumphant Democratic majority at Chicago have therefore set the example of discarding the regular partisan divisions in the treatment of the currency question. It raises a new issue, they say, in which all those who favor the free coinage of silver are in one party, and all those opposed to it are their political enemies, no matter what may have been their previous partisan affiliations. For the time being there are only two parties, the gold party, standing for the honorable maintenance of the money standard of more than half a century, and the silver party, which would cut it in half. This Populist combination made their joint platform accordingly at Chicago. It was constructed with a careful view to the conciliation of Republicans, Populists, Socialists, and every discontented and revolutionary element in society, and with the distinct and avowed purpose of driving away Democrats remaining loyal to the essential principles of Democracy, and forcing them into a third-party movement that would divide the opposition to repudiation.

The Democrats in violent contest at Chicago thus released every Democrat from his old party obligations in this particular canvass. They deliberately broke up the Democratic party. Their motto was, rule or ruin; and they made their appeal in unmistakable terms to a new party, in which were to be merged the revolutionary forces within all the old parties and the anarchical spirit which had rejected partisan control altogether. They expected also to force into the support of their new party even the great body of dissenting Democrats, because of the undoubted regularity of the Chicago Convention in a strict party sense. They perverted the machinery of the Democratic organization to put in nomination a man who declared only last year in a public speech that "nothing in heaven above, or on the earth below, or in hell beneath could make me support a gold-standard candidate on a gold-standard platform," yet they proceeded on the assumption that they could drag and bulldoze the run of gold-standard Democrats into supporting his candidacy simply because he headed a ticket nominally Democratic.

Those they could not thus draw to the assistance of their revolutionary scheme they meant to drive into the support of a separate ticket, which would work to their advantage.

Accordingly, there is no party obligation of any kind which binds Democrats to support the Chicago nominations. The ticket was not set up and the platform was not constructed with any view to the preservation of Democratic principle and doctrine, but in utter defiance of the party teachings. The bolt from Democracy was made by the majority controlling the Chicago Convention when it spurned true Democracy and courted silver Republicanism, Populism, and Anarchy.

In this campaign, therefore, the two parties struggling for supremacy are the party of repudiation and revolution, headed by BRYAN and composed of recreant Democrats and Republicans and original Populists, and the party of national honor and for the preservation of our American institutions, headed by McKinley and composed of all honest and reasonable Americans. Every Democrat and every Republican loyal to his party and his country must vote for WILLIAM McKINLEY. There is no other ticket for them before the people.

## The Rising Tide of Immigration.

There are several interesting features in the statistics of the arrivals of immigrants at New York during the year that ended with July 30. The story of this port is practically the story of the whole country, for, out of 279,948 total arrivals last year, exclusive of those from Canada and Mexico, 219,000 were at New York alone. The same ratio of more than three-fourths at this one port has held for many years.

We may assume, therefore, that the arrival of 263,709 immigrants here at New York, thus surpassing the number not only for last year but for the year previous, shows a gain for the country as a whole. The year ending June 30, 1895, has the lowest record of any of the past sixteen years, and next to it comes the year ending June

30, 1894, although that had been somewhat larger; but now the tide may once more be called that of the young flood.

The next most noteworthy fact is the great Italian immigration, which not only headed the list, but amounted to one-third as much as that of all other countries combined. A like gain over last year's figures was shown by the Austro-Hungarian immigration, which stood second on the list. Russia, the third, also showed a gain.

There were debarré at this port for the year 2,624 immigrants, of whom 102 were afterward admitted under bond on appeal from Commissioner SIKENSKI's decision. This left 2,522 actually debarré, if we have the correct figures. Last year the debarré at New York numbered only 2,077, and 60 of these were not from Europe; still the total immigration is larger now. But it is noteworthy that 1,369, or over half those sent back, were from Italy, whereas the Italian immigration was only one-fourth of the whole. Austria-Hungary and Russia furnished together 908 that had to be sent back, and Germany 104, which left very few for other countries. Likelihood of becoming paupers and the alien contract labor law are the two chief causes of exclusion. Finally, out of the 96,445 Italians, which by the way, included 14,236 who had been here before, there were 30,728 who could neither read nor write, and out of 24,290 Germans there were only 410.

Congress discussed immigration at great length during the last session, particularly on the question of illiteracy, and next winter, when the debate is renewed, as it doubtless will be, this new batch of statistics will play a prominent part.

The McKinley of the Past and the McKinley of the Present.

The nomination by the St. Louis Convention of Governor MORTON, or even of Speaker REED, stalwart partisan as he is, would have rendered somewhat easier the concentration of the sound-money Democratic vote on the candidate for whom sound-money Democrats can most effectively cast their ballots under the present circumstances. This is now obvious to Republicans and Democrats alike, but it is no longer a matter of practical interest.

The talk heard here and there about the necessity of a third ticket proceeds from quarters where the hatred of McKINLEY, personally and politically, has been in past years the strongest. Because McKINLEY's name was identified with high protection, and because it yet typifies in the minds of many Democrats what they formerly regarded as the greatest crime of the age and the gravest danger to our country's future, it is harder for these Democrats to contemplate the idea of voting for him now than it would be in the case of any other Republican whom the St. Louis Convention could have nominated. In some States the desire for a third ticket is inspired by purely local considerations. But very generally it is true that the most earnest advocates of another Democratic ticket, as against the policy of direct Democratic votes for McKINLEY, are those gentlemen who would find it personally most uncomfortable to vote for WILLIAM McKINLEY as a representative of honest money.

This feeling exists, and it must be taken into account.

On the other hand, it is probably true that Democratic reluctance to accept Major McKINLEY as the representative of principles above and beyond partisanship is stronger now at the beginning of the canvass than it will be at any future time. Even after his nomination at St. Louis, and up to the time of the meeting of the Chicago Convention, McKINLEY was presented to the country as the champion of high protection, in a campaign in which that was the supreme issue. That is all changed now, by the operation of forces superior to the plans and projects of any politician or set of politicians; but the change is so recent and it was so sudden that there is little personal opposition to McKINLEY should he be at the polls.

As the campaign goes on, the overruling importance of making every honest money vote do its utmost against the repudiators and the revolutionists will become more clearly apparent in its relation to individual duty. The McKINLEY of the past, naturally obnoxious to thousands and hundreds of thousands of sincere friends of tariff reform, will be less conspicuous than the McKINLEY of the present, representing first of all the preservation of the nation's honor, and standing for all that honest-money Democrats and honest-money Republicans hold in common. It is for this second McKINLEY, this new and regenerated McKINLEY, if you please, that THE SUN asks patriotic Americans to vote without regard to party nomenclature.

In this crisis do not waste one-half of the defensive efficiency of your ballot!

## How England Has Fleeced Ireland.

It will be remembered that by Mr. GLADSTONE's second Home Rule bill, which passed the House of Commons, Ireland's share of the amount required for imperial expenditure was assessed at a certain sum, which was to be a first charge upon the Irish revenues. The assessment was declared by the British Liberals to be reasonable, one, because it was based upon the contribution which Ireland had for some years made, and is now making, to the imperial exchequer. Mr. THOMAS SEXTON, however, who among the Irish Nationalists is best qualified to deal with financial problems, contended that Ireland was paying much more than her fair share, and he challenged the Government to make his charge the subject of an official inquiry. Of the investigation which was ordered, and which has been proceeding for three years, it shows that Ireland is plundered by Great Britain to the extent of nearly \$14,000,000 a year, and that a restitution of the surplus long unjustly wrong from her would place a vast sum at her disposal.

The Royal Commission appointed by Mr. GLADSTONE for the purpose of examining the fiscal treatment of Ireland comprised a number of eminent officials and ex-officials of financial experience, together with Mr. SEXTON, Mr. EDWARD BLAKE, and Mr. JOHN E. REDMOND, representatives of the Nationalist party. Practically the burden of sustaining the case for Ireland fell upon Mr. SEXTON, while the defence of the course pursued by the British Treasury was undertaken by Lord KELLY and Lord FARHAM, both of whom entered on the inquiry thoroughly convinced of the rightfulness of the existing arrangements. These very men have been converted, however, to the opposite view, and they have with signed the report of the Commission which has recently been issued, and which sets forth overwhelming proofs of the injustice which Ireland has suffered for many years. The report declares that instead of bearing, as she now bears, and as Mr. GLADSTONE thought she should continue to bear

under a home-rule régime, one-eleventh part of the imperial taxation, she ought, as a matter of fact, to bear only a twentieth part. That is to say, instead of contributing, as she now does yearly, to the British Treasury \$37,500,000, she ought in equity to contribute only \$24,000,000. These figures tell a shocking tale of wrong, which even British Unionists will be unable to hear unmoved. They mean that from the Irish, who are notoriously poor, have been exacted annually \$13,500,000 in excess of their legitimate proportion of imperial taxation.

The service which Mr. THOMAS SEXTON has thus rendered to his countrymen will have immediate and substantial results. A restitution, indeed, of the huge sums exacted from a poverty-stricken land may be demanded in vain, but in view of the report of the Royal Commission, the Chancellor of the Exchequer in his next budget cannot avoid making a signal reduction of the taxes levied upon Ireland.

## Campaign Literature.

The most effective campaign document against Mr. BRYAN yet produced is the Chicago platform, on which he stands. This alone will beat him, if a majority of the voters of the United States are against repudiation, robbery, and revolution.

Next to the Chicago platform itself, we should say that the most damaging piece of anti-BRYAN literature now in circulation is the verbatim report of a remark of his own at Jackson, Miss., on June 11, 1895. Mr. BRYAN was speaking for populism and free silver. Judge BRAKEM of Jackson asked him squarely if he would support the action of the Democratic National Convention if it should fail to put free silver at 16 to 1 in its platform. Mr. BRYAN replied:

"So help me God, I will die in my tracks before I will support it."

This declaration, a year in advance of the Convention which nominated BRYAN and put free silver at 16 to 1 in its platform, has been discovered by the *Courier-Journal* and is used by that truly Democratic journal with powerful effect. BRYAN's repudiation of party allegiance at Jackson was repeated in slightly different language at Birmingham, Ala., when he said in reply to a similar question:

"Nothing in heaven above, on the earth below, or in hell beneath could make me support a gold-standard candidate on a gold-standard platform."

These utterances are rapidly convincing Democrats that the claims of loyalty to party and obedience to the dictates of Convention cannot be urged in behalf of the man who uttered them.

## Bryan's Two Factions.

There are two ways to assist in electing the candidate dedicated to repudiation at Chicago. One is to champion BRYAN directly; the other is to abuse McKINLEY, the candidate whose defeat means BRYAN's election. To all genuine Democrats we say: "Don't gratify disappointment over Chicago by venting prejudices against the candidate who, if he is not technically a Democrat, cannot be a party man, and for a Democrat, he is an American and no Republican." Remember that it is either McKINLEY or BRYAN.

"We were promised prosperity immediately after the demonetization of silver," says John A. McLean, a prominent Democrat. "You were promised nothing. The demonetization of silver was the formal and perfect act of declaring uncollectible a metal which, at the time, and for years previously, nobody had wanted to coin. No promises were made and no attention was paid to it. If instead of silver's production and sale, there had been a demand for gold, and if gold had grown still dearer, and if gold had ceased to be produced at all, the 'crime' of 1873 would never have been heard of, and gold would have remained the money standard without criticism or complaint."

It was when silver grew cheap that the Democrats, instead of reviving it for its coinage and paying debts with it.

The search for "the original BRYAN man" continues to be pursued with feverish excitement. The Hon. S. A. NEWM of Salem, Ill., the place henceforth illustrious as the birthplace of the Boy Orator, nominated him for President in May, 1895, and has put in a claim for the honor of being "the original BRYAN man." The Hon. I. N. NEWM of Louisiana, Mo., crushes Mr. NEWM, and avers that he himself nominated the Infant Prodigy on a 16 to 1 platform, Oct. 23, 1894. The editor of the *Lafayette Journal*, a Maryland paper, mentioned Mr. BRYAN as a "Presidential possibility." Aug. 9, 1894, after a long investigation goes on, but the truth of the matter is easy enough to find without any quest. The man who first nominated Mr. BRYAN, the original BRYAN man, lives, when he is not roaming about sporting free silver, at Lincoln, Neb., and his name is WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN.

The voice of the Hon. JACK CHINN bounces over the valleys and leaps among the mountains of Kentucky. He collects the silver knight; he drives the goldsmith in bodily armor before him. His countenance is a war map; detonations and the order of battle mark his triumphant progress. And wherever he goes he trolls out the sweet ditty with which he and three other mighty men of their lungs regaled Mr. BRYAN at Chicago:

"We're silver men from head to foot,  
O Lord, there's trouble in the land;  
To placate us give the gold,  
O Lord, there's trouble in the land;  
We'll rear up Wall street by the root,  
O Lord, there's trouble in the land;  
We'll end the goldbugs on the run,  
We'll beat them with 16 to 1.  
Placatory will be undone,  
O Lord, there's trouble in the land!"

Col. CURRY is to be Secretary of War in the Platte Cabinet.

In these days of precocious politicians, the muse of history is justified in giving a melting sally to the Hon. T. J. HILL of Corleto, Ga. This statesman is even more brilliant than the Boy Orator, for he is only 21. After the Boy Orator's prize dinner in the Chicago Convention, Mr. T. J. HILL, circulated among the other Cracker delegates, and with all the fervor of his years, begged them to vote for the prize speaker. As powerful in his muscles as in his mind, Mr. HILL was one of the three strong and rejoicing ones who Mr. BRYAN left after that great declamation and deposited him, shaken by happy, in his seat. A place in the Cabinet or a Consulship or something ought to be the reward promised to this active young Georgia statesman. He is a man after Mr. BRYAN's own heart.

We salute the Glencraun, and we hail her victory with friendly submission and sporting sympathy. We have been asked in a recent contest for the first time in many years, and we desire to do honor to the victor without reserve. It was not, though, strictly speaking, an international contest, for the reason that the Glencraun is an American boat, and a creation of this country's shipyard repeats the old story that a bigger sail spread wing, even if it has to drive a bigger boat.

Poor, silly, sappy, blimpious, asinine GEORGE FRANKLIN LOVELL.

Tut, tut! What's the use of getting excited in the dog days? Has a great statesman ceased to be a great statesman in ten days? There must be fragments of the old aureole around the head of the Dedham DEMOCRAT yet; and his name is not GEORGE FRANKLIN, but GEORGE FRANK. He is not poor; he is rich in the consciousness of himself.

Genius would recognize genius even if they met in a coal mine. Here is the Hon. MANTON BUTLER, better known as the Honeycutt of Dingding, a Populist Senator in Congress from North Carolina. Mr. BUTLER is even younger, if possible, than the Boy Orator, but just as full of home words and sentiment, which he has full of words that he can empty the Senate Chamber more quickly than any other man, with the possible exception of the Hon. WILLIAM MORRIS STEWART. He is so full of populism that he is almost a Populist party in himself. He is so full of silver that a few years ago he firmly rejected the gold-headed coin which his fellow citizens in Honeycutt's wished to bestow upon him. And he expects to become President himself some day. He has held on high the standard of populism and sworn never to give it up. But how can he stand out against the money power and the gold bug? In his newspaper he admits that he "is warming up no little to the young statesman" of the Platte. It is a glorious sight to see the Platte rolling its mellifluous waves along Honeycutt's, but it is difficult to understand how Mr. BUTLER can "warm up." He is at white heat all the time.

Among the interesting things that politics have to do with is the reported fact that the grandnephew of Candidate SWEET was the same SWEET who was tried for the murder of the late Governor. But what of it?—Boston Globe.

Oh, nothing much. Only if Mr. ANTHONY SWEET were the grandson of the pious, much-quoted, deep-thinking old Judge, the Massachusetts Historian. The report is somewhat surprising. That repentant witchfinder died one hundred and sixty years ago.

The right place for the headquarters of the Hon. JOHN PARSON ALTZOFFER's party is Haymarket square, Chicago.

## THE DEMOCRATIC REVOLT.

Continued Repudiation of the Populist Free-silver Chicago Platform.

From the *Michigan Union*.

The Democrats of Washington county cannot and will not support any candidate placed on the Populist platform adopted last week at Chicago.

From the *Davenport Morning Democrat*.

It is painful to see a party which, less than four years ago was endorsed by such an overwhelming majority in the election of its leader to the Presidency now abandon the principles which led to its most signal triumph. The cardinal principle which it has now repudiated is that of non-resistance to evil by non-violence.

From the *La Crosse (Wis.) Chronicle*.

The *Chronicle* is not a Populist newspaper. It cannot support a Populist for President of the United States. It would support no man on earth on the platform adopted at Chicago.

From the *Waterbury (Conn.) Telegraph*.

That the *Waterbury* cannot stand on the 16 to 1 platform should not astonish any of its readers. After advocating the burning political principle which it has now repudiated, it has, it simply would prove inconsistent, and could not hereafter risk coming before its readers with either opinion or policy if it now would join the filled-with-hate-of-Cleveland, revolutionary, half-balanced gang, Albiged of Illinois and his cohorts. We sincerely believe that the *Waterbury* will not do this, and for a party to stand and abide by the acts, decisions and principles declared in Convention, as long as the fundamental principles of the party are not disturbed, and the *Waterbury* has always strictly followed this rule. But the platform of repudiation, a greenback, free silver, socialist, demagogic, unprincipled, and unscrupulous, and a platform of measure all this, but not Democratic and for that reason is not binding on any Democrat. So far no Democratic organ of any note has come to our notice which does not justly condemn and denounce the platform as demagogic, pernicious, and ruinous.

From the *Keosauqua (Iowa) Democrat*.

It would seem that in turning their backs upon the leader who restored the party to power after a retirement of a quarter of a century and in becoming the sponsors of a vitiated currency the Democratic politicians who prepared the Chicago platform at Chicago have prepared the way for another Waterloo, and for a defeat as overwhelming and disastrous as that which overtook the Democracy in 1860, when the enlightened and humane sentiment of the country repudiated that corrupted organization because of its cowardly and servile devotion to the slave and his human bondage.

From the *Keosauqua (Iowa) Democrat*.

Wherever a faction puts itself in control of a party and makes the same subservient to its own interests and forces upon such party a creed which is inimical to the best interests of the whole people, then there is no more room for the party's patriotic citizens in such an organization, and a separation becomes necessary. The common weal ought to stand for something higher than the success of the party; and since we consider the interests of this country at present safer under Republican administration than under a revolutionary element, we are prepared to support the Republican administration and the perpetrators of a coup d'état, therefore the Democrat will support in the present campaign the ticket headed by McKinley and Hobart.

From the *Keosauqua (Iowa) Democrat*.

Populists are true sheep in sheep's clothing like a wolf in sheep's clothing. It is a pity that a convention in Chicago, and, degrading conservative Democracy, has elevated a false god as its idol, and calls upon the people of the nation to offer up sacrifice to the new and strange deity—Free Silver. The fervent pleadings of honest and patriotic citizens in the Convention, the wisest councils were passed by unheeded; even the still, small voice of conscience was stifled while the majority in its might perpetrated its rash deed of committing these United States to a false deity, discredited, and dishonest policy.

Is the Democratic party going to stand by the endorsement of an absurd, abortive, and revolutionary nomination? Is it going to swallow complacently the bitter pill which the unscrupulous and irresponsible demagogues have prepared for it? Is it going to bow meekly before the tyrannical and despotic rule of a few, and surrender to the dictation of such political biathroscites as PITCHER Ben Tillman and Socialist Albiged?

From the *Keosauqua (Iowa) Democrat*.

The *Times* will not, cannot, advocate the adoption and acceptance by the American people of the populist, anarchistic, un-democratic, and anti-Democratic measures and men presented for endorsement by the Chicago Convention.

From the *Keosauqua (Iowa) Democrat*.

True Democrats Must Vote for McKinley.

From *Union Times*.

A Convention of men gone mad with a fallacy met in Chicago under the name of Democrats and made a platform so antagonistic to the principles on which the Democratic party was founded, and which have governed it since the days of Jefferson, that no true Democrat can stand upon it.

From the *Keosauqua (Iowa) Democrat*.

To secure honest money and the integrity of the nation's credit, true Democrats must vote the Republican electoral ticket.

For Populists' Defeat.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN:—As a reader of THE SUN and as one intensely interested in the maintenance of the integrity of our country and in the defeat of Populism and anarchy, I am glad to see on the stand you have taken by coming out for McKinley.

From the *Keosauqua (Iowa) Democrat*.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN:—Sir: As a reader of THE SUN and as one intensely interested in the maintenance of the integrity of our country and in the defeat of Populism and anarchy, I am glad to see on the stand you have taken by coming out for McKinley.

## BRYAN AS LINCOLN KNOWS HIM.

A Searching Analysis of the Man as He Is in His Home Town.

LINCOLN, Neb., July 16.—It has taken the people of Bryan's home a full week to calm down. For two or three days after the nomination the free silverites and Populists and half the Republicans were in a state of frenzy. The novelty of having one of their neighbors chosen as the Presidential candidate of a great party was almost too much for them. The people are more rational now, but the feeling of local pride, always strong in a Western community, is aroused as it has never been aroused before, and it is safe to say that of the votes that will be cast for Bryan electors in the State outside of what has been his legitimate following for six years, three-fourths will go to him not because of sudden conversion to the cause of free silver, but because Bryan is a Nebraskan. It is difficult to make Eastern people understand the depth of this feeling of local pride.

The people of the country have not yet ceased wondering at Bryan's historic feat at Chicago. It is not at all surprising to the people here to know the man and are familiar with his remarkable dramatic gifts and oratorical graces. Bryan had already won all the distinction it was possible for him to win in this State before the Chicago Convention, but he had many friends here who for the last year have been looking forward to the time when he would get a place on the Presidential ticket of the Populist or Democratic party.

The sober, intelligent, conservative people of Nebraska have long since taken an adequate measure of the character and mental capacity of Bryan, and although they give him credit for the possession of admirable personal qualities, they have him firmly fixed in the category of demagogues, Socialists, and cranks.

Bryan has taken the crude demagogues of Albiged and Tillman and worked it over in the crucible of sophistry, and refined it and polished it into a product as fine as the free coinage of silver. There have been many who have been fooled by it. The most radical utterance of the PITCHER Senator or the Anarchist Governor finds in Bryan ready and emphatic endorsement, but his endorsement is in the seductive guise of sentimental sympathy. Albiged and Tillman are the cause of sound government, with hammer and tongs, with bomb and battering ram. Bryan's endeavor are in precisely the same direction, but he avoids the tactics of bulldog belligerency and seeks to win his way by beguiling first the outposts and then the garri-

He is diplomatic, facile, agile, oily-tongued. He is a finished actor, a brilliant low comedian. He represents everything that Albiged and Tillman represent, many things that are distasteful to most thinking, reasoning people, but he presents his views in such a way that he deludes and deceives. Radical to the last degree, he is a demagogue in the most dangerous sense, he convinces people that he is as innocent as a lamb. Acting in the role of an ingenu, he is full of guile. He wages his campaign behind the mask of conciliation. He appears to be pouring oil on the troubled waters, while he is in reality adding to the turbulence.

Bryan is singularly fortunate in his physical presence. He is a handsome man. His features are classic, clear-cut, fine-lined. When he appears before an audience he awakens interest and sympathy. When he begins to speak he takes on an air of the most perfect sincerity, the greatest candor. His manner is so simple, so plain, so earnest, so frank that his hearers are irresistibly drawn to him. Then good humor is depicted in his countenance. As he speaks he looks at the audience and expects it to be infectious. It catches the audience, he is pathetically honest. It is doubtful if there is another man in the country so gifted in the superficial, showy qualities of oratory. He has wonderful surface brilliancy.

Bryan is not a hypocrite in the sense in which the term is ordinarily used. There is no pretention in his simplicity of his manner of life. He is honest in his comparative poverty. He does not seek to hoodwink the public for the benefit of some financial interest. He cannot be accused of lack of integrity. But he does use the term in a sense which is not true. He is seeking. He has taken so long about the "common people" and the bondage in which they are held, and has so persistently advanced specious theories for their relief, that he has worked up a certain amount of ecstatic fervor that makes him passionate and emotional.

He is a finished actor, a brilliant low comedian. He represents everything that Albiged and Tillman represent, many things that are distasteful to most thinking, reasoning people, but he presents his views in such a way that he deludes and deceives. Radical to the last degree, he is a demagogue in the most dangerous sense, he convinces people that he is as innocent as a lamb. Acting in the role of an ingenu, he is full of guile. He wages his campaign behind the mask of conciliation. He appears to be pouring oil on the troubled waters, while he is in reality adding to the turbulence.

Bryan is singularly fortunate in his physical presence. He is a handsome man. His features are classic, clear-cut, fine-lined. When he appears before an audience he awakens interest and sympathy. When he begins to speak he takes on an air of the most perfect sincerity, the greatest candor. His manner is so simple, so plain, so earnest, so frank that his hearers are irresistibly drawn to him. Then good humor is depicted in his countenance. As he speaks he looks at the audience and expects it to be infectious. It catches the audience, he is pathetically honest. It is doubtful if there is another man in the country so gifted in the superficial, showy qualities of oratory. He has wonderful surface brilliancy.

Bryan is not a hypocrite in the sense in which the term is ordinarily used. There is no pretention in his simplicity of his manner of life. He is honest in his comparative poverty. He does not seek to hoodwink the public for the benefit of some financial interest. He cannot be accused of lack of integrity. But he does use the term in a sense which is not true. He is seeking. He has taken so long about the "common people" and the bondage in which they are held, and has so persistently advanced specious theories for their relief, that he has worked up a certain amount of ecstatic fervor that makes him passionate and emotional.

He is a finished actor, a brilliant low comedian. He represents everything that Albiged and Tillman represent, many things that are distasteful to most thinking, reasoning people, but he presents his views in such a way that he deludes and deceives. Radical to the last degree, he is a demagogue in the most dangerous sense, he convinces people that he is as innocent as a lamb. Acting in the role of an ingenu, he is full of guile. He wages his campaign behind the mask of conciliation. He appears to be pouring oil on the troubled waters, while he is in reality adding to the turbulence.

Bryan is singularly fortunate in his physical presence. He is a handsome man. His features are classic, clear-cut, fine-lined. When he appears before an audience he awakens interest and sympathy. When he begins to speak he takes on an air of the most perfect sincerity, the greatest candor. His manner is so simple, so plain, so earnest, so frank that his hearers are irresistibly drawn to him. Then good humor is depicted in his countenance. As he speaks he looks at the audience and expects it to be infectious. It catches the audience, he is pathetically honest. It is doubtful if there is another man in the country so gifted in the superficial, showy qualities of oratory. He has wonderful surface brilliancy.

Bryan is not a hypocrite in the sense in which the term is ordinarily used. There is no pretention in his simplicity of his manner of life. He is honest in his comparative poverty. He does not seek to hoodwink the public for the benefit of some financial interest. He cannot be accused of lack of integrity. But he does use the term in a sense which is not true. He is seeking. He has taken so long about the "common people" and the bondage in which they are held, and has so persistently advanced specious theories for their relief, that he has worked up a certain amount of ecstatic fervor that makes him passionate and emotional.

He is a finished actor, a brilliant low comedian. He represents everything that Albiged and Tillman represent, many things that are distasteful to most thinking, reasoning people, but he presents his views in such a way that he deludes and deceives. Radical to the last degree, he is a demagogue in the most dangerous sense, he convinces people that he is as innocent as a lamb. Acting in the role of an ingenu, he is full of guile. He wages his campaign behind the mask of conciliation. He appears to be pouring oil on the troubled waters, while he is in reality adding to the turbulence.

Bryan is singularly fortunate in his physical presence. He is a handsome man. His features are classic, clear-cut, fine-lined. When he appears before an audience he awakens interest and sympathy. When he begins to speak he takes on an air of the most perfect sincerity, the greatest candor. His manner is so simple, so plain, so earnest, so frank that his hearers are irresistibly drawn to him. Then good humor is depicted in his countenance. As he speaks he looks at the audience and expects it to be infectious. It catches the audience, he is pathetically honest. It is doubtful if there is another man in the country so gifted in the superficial, showy qualities of oratory. He has wonderful surface brilliancy.

Bryan is not a hypocrite in the sense in which the term is ordinarily used. There is no pretention in his simplicity of his manner of life. He is honest in his comparative poverty. He does not seek to hoodwink the public for the benefit of some financial interest. He cannot be accused of lack of integrity. But he does use the term in a sense which is not true. He is seeking. He has taken so long about the "common people" and the bondage in which they are held, and has so persistently advanced specious theories for their relief, that he has worked up a certain amount of ecstatic fervor that makes him passionate and emotional.

He is a finished actor, a brilliant low comedian. He represents everything that Albiged and Tillman represent, many things that are distasteful to most thinking, reasoning people, but he presents his views in such a way that he deludes and deceives. Radical to the last degree, he is a demagogue in the most dangerous sense, he convinces people that he is as innocent as a lamb. Acting in the role of an ingenu, he is full of guile. He wages his campaign behind the mask of